REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-21 were originally submitted.

Claims 1 and 12 were previously amended to correct typographical errors.

No claims are cancelled.

Claims 1-21 remain in this application.

Response to Arguments

The Action states that "Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-12 of Remarks, filed February 4, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 15, 18, and 19 under U.S. Patent No. 6549654 to Kumada have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn".

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,654 to Kumada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,636 to Beach et al (Beach). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kumada teaches an image processing apparatus having a discriminating unit that discriminates a data type of a color document and a selecting unit that selects an output device for outputting the color document from a plurality of output devices. The particular output device is selected in accordance with a discrimination result by the discriminating unit and color reproduction range information of output devices. The output device can be selected from a plurality

of output devices, while taking into consideration the color reproduction ability of each output device with respect to the data type of each color document. (Abstract of Kumada).

Beach teaches hardcopy versions of images include or are embedded with digital machine readable full color specifications of full color source images through the use of a self-clocking glyph code. The color specification can be recovered from the hardcopy version even if the hardcopy is monochromatic, allowing a digital highlight color copier to use the color specification to index into a plurality of different full-color to highlight-color transforms and select the transform or transforms that are most appropriate for rendering a highlight color copy of the source image. (Abstract of Beach).

Independent claim 1 recites "[a] method for selecting a color map for use in printing a document, comprising:

> obtaining color space information about the document;
>
> obtaining at least two color maps; and
>
> determining which of the at least two color maps will result in a printed document that is more consistent with the color space information and a desired rendering intent.

The Action argues that "Kumada disclose(s) a system, method and program (column 15, lines 52-56) for selecting a color map for use in printing a document". Applicant's previous arguments as to Kumada, and considered by the Office, are found to be persuasive. As argued in Applicant's response dated February 4, 2005, Kumada does not teach or suggest mapping, and particularly does not teach or suggest selecting a color map. The Action cites column 15, lines 52-56 of Kumada which simply states "[t]he scope of the invention includes a system or

apparatus whose computer (CPU or MPU) runs to operate various devices connected thereto in accordance with software program codes supplied to the system or apparatus so as to realize the functions of the above embodiments". As argued previously, and found by the Office to be persuasive, Kumada does not teach mapping and specifically does not teach color mapping. As discussed above, Kumada teaches selecting an output device from a plurality of output devices based on a data type of a color document.

The Action further looks to Kumada as teaching "obtaining color space information about the document" citing Kumada "Figure 25, reference S1101; column 10, lines 25-28". Step 1101 of Kumada teaches that "the type of color document data is checked". (Kumada, col. 10, lines 13-14). "The type of color document data can be checked from the data format of each object image contained in a color document. For example, an image of the color document is written by a bit map format, and a drawing is written with vector information, and a character is written with a character code". (Kumada, col. 10, lines 13-14). There is no teaching or suggestion in this section, or in Kumada in general, as to "color space information about the document" as recited in claim 1 as applied to selecting a color map for printing the document.

The Action admits "Kumada does not disclose obtaining at least two color maps and determining which of the at least two color maps will result in a printed document that is more consistent with the color space information and a desired rendering intent". The Action looks to Beach as teaching this element, citing Beach "column 4, lines 4-27; column 6, lines 8-12, lines 29-35". Col. 4 lines 4-27 of Beach teaches image segmentation techniques that can be applied to sections of

a digital image. Mapping is taught; however, the mapping that is taught is directed to creating a particular color map of the digital image.

Col. 6, lines 8-12, lines 29-35 of Beach teaches a "glyph code". The glyph code may be recognized by a pattern of glyphs that are written on the hardcopy document. (Beach col. 5, lines 26-28). "If the glyph code provides a full color PDL description of the source image, the PDL description is used to select the optimal full color-to-highlight color mappings for rendering the image as a highlight color image". (Beach col. 6, lines 8-12). "Provision can also be made, for encoding a pointer to specific full color-to-highlight color mapping in a glyph code. Such a pointer is interpreted as a mandatory instruction, so the specified full color-to-highlight color mapping is selected for rendering the image region to which the pointer applies". (Beach col. 6, lines 29-35). The cited section of Beach is directed to pointing to a color mapping of an image section of a particular document. There is no teaching in the cited section as to "obtaining at least two color maps and determining which of the at least two color maps will result in a printed document that is more consistent with the color space information and a desired rendering intent" as particularly recited in claim 1.

The combination of Kumada and Beach fails to teach each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 10 depends on claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on base claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 15, 18, and 19 are rejected based on similar reasons as claim 1. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 1, in support of

claims 15, 18, and 19. The combination of Kumada and Beach fails to teach each and every element of claims 15, 18, and 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 15, 18, and 19 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 16 and 17 depend on claim 15, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 15. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 16 and 17 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 20 and 21 depend on claim 19, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 19. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 20 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,636 to Lloyd et al (Lloyd). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Lloyd discloses(s) a method, wherein the at least two color maps are derived from color information obtained by sensors in a print path of a printer (column 6, lines 9-16)". However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. Therefore, Lloyd provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claim 2. Since Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lloyd does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Lloyd is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,930 to Ohta et al (Ohta). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Ohta et al discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the determining step comprises: analyzing a boundary of each color map (column 5, lines 9-20); and performing a best-fit analysis with respect to the color space information (Ohta et al disclose a system that determines whether input image data is within gamut of output device (column 4, lines 50-60)". However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 depend. Therefore, Ohta provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Ohta does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Ohta is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,646,762 to Balasubramanian et al (Balasubramanian). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 8 depends from claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Balasubramanian et al discloses a method for generating a custom gamut mapping (Figure 6, reference G1; column 5, lines 33-36)." However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the

elements of claim 1, from which claim 8 depends. Therefore, Balasubramanian provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claim 8. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Balasubramanian does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Balasubramanian is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,071 to Goodman et al (Goodman). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 9 depends from claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Goodman et al disclose a method of claim 1, additionally comprising: previewing an approximation of a printed appearance of the document based on at least one of the at least two color maps (column 4, lines 49-54)". However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claim 9 depends. Therefore, Goodman provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claim 9. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Goodman does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Goodman is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 5,806,081 to Swen et al (Swen). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

The Action argues as to claim 11, "Swen et al disclose a method of claim 1, wherein the desired rendering intent is based on an absolute colorimetric (column 8, lines 52-54)" and as to claim 12, "Swen et al disclose a method where in desired the rendering intent is based on a perceptual rendering intent (column 8, lines 52-54)". However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claims 11 and 12 depend. Therefore, Swen provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited methods of claims 11 and 12. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Swen does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Swen is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 11 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,693,718 to Takaoka (Takaoka). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 13 depends from claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Takaoka discloses a method of claim 1, additionally comprising locating the at least two color maps on a print server (column 9, lines 16-20, lines 24-27; Figure 9)". However, Kumada

and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claim 13 depends. Therefore, Takaoka provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claim 13. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Takaoka does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Takaoka is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of Beach, in further view of U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6633400 to Sasaki et al (Sasaki). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 14 depends from claim 1, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. The Action argues "Sasaki et al disclose a method of claim 1, additionally comprising locating the at least two color maps on individual printers (column 8, lines 20-27)". However, Kumada and Beach do not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claim 14 depends. Therefore, Goodman provides no assistance in light of Kumada and Beach as to the recited method of claim 14. Since Kumada and Beach does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Sasaki does not help. Accordingly, a combination of Kumada, Beach, and Sasaki is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/26/05

By: _____

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256